

*United States v. Adams*, No. 24 Cr. 556 (DEH)

Exhibit C

March 25, 2025 Government Submission

**From:** [Wikstrom, Derek \(USANYS\)](#)  
**To:** [Rohrbach, Andrew \(USANYS\)](#); [Cohen, Celia \(USANYS\) 1](#); [Scotten, Hagan \(USANYS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Damian Article Response  
**Date:** Monday, January 20, 2025 6:17:55 PM

---

I know that none of us were motivated by Damian's political aspirations, but I don't think any of us know for sure what motivated Damian. Anyway, I thought grain of salt was appropriately calibrated to what we can say about Adams's/Spiro's motivations.

---

Derek Wikstrom  
Assistant United States Attorney  
United States Attorney's Office  
Southern District of New York  
26 Federal Plaza, 37<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10278  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Rohrbach, Andrew (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 20, 2025 6:07 PM  
**To:** Wikstrom, Derek (USANYS) [REDACTED]; Cohen, Celia (USANYS) 1  
[REDACTED]; Scotten, Hagan (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Damian Article Response

My thinking on "grain of salt" versus "rejected" is that we want to say he is wrong about his claim that our prosecution is motivated by Damian's political interests, and not just that people should be skeptical. Certainly not wedded to a particular word.

---

**From:** Wikstrom, Derek (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 20, 2025 6:01 PM  
**To:** Rohrbach, Andrew (USANYS) [REDACTED]; Cohen, Celia (USANYS) 1  
[REDACTED]; Scotten, Hagan (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Damian Article Response

For whatever it's worth, I wanted to put in votes in favor of "grain of salt" on stylistic grounds, and of retaining n.3 and rejecting approval by Main Justice on substantive ones. Happy to discuss all of this obviously.

---

Derek Wikstrom  
Assistant United States Attorney  
United States Attorney's Office  
Southern District of New York  
26 Federal Plaza, 37<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10278



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Rohrbach, Andrew (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 20, 2025 5:20:02 PM  
**To:** Cohen, Celia (USANYS) 1 [REDACTED]; Scotten, Hagan (USANYS) [REDACTED]; Wikstrom, Derek (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Damian Article Response

Some suggestions in the attached. I've tried to accommodate Celia's suggestions and Hagan's concerns. I agree that we should create some space from Damian, but I also think we should avoid anything that looks like us fighting with Damian (which would be counterproductive).

I also added a little bit of language to respond a little bit more to their legal argument, insofar as they make one.

---

**From:** Cohen, Celia (USANYS) 1 [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 20, 2025 4:48 PM  
**To:** Scotten, Hagan (USANYS) [REDACTED]; Wikstrom, Derek (USANYS) [REDACTED]; Rohrbach, Andrew (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Damian Article Response

For whatever it's worth, here was my thinking on a couple things.

I was hesitating on the MJ point for the same reason you articulate but it does cut against the suggestion that DW cooked this up on his own so he could run for mayor.

On the line prosecutor point, I don't think anyone thinks a case gets charged without the involvement and recommendation of prosecutors and I think we want to create distance between those prosecutors and the US Attorney.

And on the Grand Jury point, I agree that the sentence structure I proposed is bad. But I would like to get in there the point that one of you made on our call that at the end of the day, it was a grand jury that chose to return the indictment and not a political appointee.

Celia V. Cohen  
Assistant United States Attorney  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Scotten, Hagan (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 20, 2025 2:39:40 PM  
**To:** Cohen, Celia (USANYS) 1 [REDACTED]; Wikstrom, Derek (USANYS) [REDACTED]; Rohrbach, Andrew (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Damian Article Response

Sorry about that

---

**From:** Cohen, Celia (USANYS) 1 [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 20, 2025 2:20 PM  
**To:** Scotten, Hagan (USANYS) [REDACTED]; Wikstrom, Derek (USANYS) [REDACTED]; Rohrbach, Andrew (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Damian Article Response

Can you resend with attachment pls?

---

**From:** Scotten, Hagan (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 20, 2025 1:49 PM  
**To:** Cohen, Celia (USANYS) 1 [REDACTED]; Wikstrom, Derek (USANYS) [REDACTED]; Rohrbach, Andrew (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Damian Article Response

Here's a version incorporating the edits I agreed with and responding to those I didn't. Andrew, do you want to weigh in? We should be in a position to move forward with this tomorrow.

---

**From:** Cohen, Celia (USANYS) 1 [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 19, 2025 11:52 PM  
**To:** Wikstrom, Derek (USANYS) [REDACTED]; Scotten, Hagan (USANYS) [REDACTED]; Rohrbach, Andrew (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Damian Article Response

Thanks for doing this. A couple thoughts in the attached.

---

**From:** Wikstrom, Derek (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 19, 2025 9:02 PM  
**To:** Scotten, Hagan (USANYS) [REDACTED]; Cohen, Celia (USANYS) 1 [REDACTED]; Rohrbach, Andrew (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Damian Article Response

Thanks for drafting, I like this. Here are some nits and one suggestion for your consideration.

---

Derek Wikstrom  
Assistant United States Attorney  
United States Attorney's Office  
Southern District of New York  
26 Federal Plaza, 37<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10278  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]



---

**From:** Scotten, Hagan (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 19, 2025 8:33 PM  
**To:** Cohen, Celia (USANYS) 1 [REDACTED]; Rohrbach, Andrew (USANYS)  
[REDACTED]; Wikstrom, Derek (USANYS) [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Damian Article Response

A draft is attached for discussion. Basically, I tried to (1) distance us from Damian enough that Ho and Trump will know we don't approve of what he did, but not so much that we magnify the scandal; (2) make some legal response on the question of relief so we still sound like lawyers, and (3) go on offense enough for Andrew but not too much for Derek with respect to EA trying to shift the focus away from the evidence.